arXiv:1405.2179v2 [cond-mat.dis-nn] 21 Aug 2014

Low-temperature dynamics of Long-Ranged Spin-Glasses : full hierarchy of relaxation times via real-space renormalization

Cécile Monthus
Institut de Physique Théorique,
CNRS and CEA Saclay
91191 Gif-sur-Yvette, France

We consider the long-ranged Ising spin-glass with random couplings decaying as a power-law of the distance, in the region of parameters where the spin-glass phase exists with a positive droplet exponent. For the Metropolis single-spin-flip dynamics near zero temperature, we construct via real-space renormalization the full hierarchy of relaxation times of the master equation for any given realization of the random couplings. We then analyze the probability distribution of dynamical barriers as a function of the spatial scale. This real-space renormalization procedure represents a simple explicit example of the droplet scaling theory, where the convergence towards local equilibrium on larger and larger scales is governed by a strong hierarchy of activated dynamical processes, with valleys within valleys.

I. INTRODUCTION

The relaxation dynamics of disordered systems towards thermal equilibrium when starting from a random initial condition at $t = 0$ (see for instance [1–4] and references therein) can be interpreted by the following picture : at time t, there exists some spatial coherence length $L(t)$ such that the smaller lengths $L < L(t)$ are in quasi-local-equilibrium, whereas the bigger lengths $L > L(t)$ are still completely out of equilibrium. In pure systems, these phenomena of phase ordering are well understood [5] and the coherence length grows algebraically $L_{pure}(t) \sim t^{1/z}$ with the dynamical exponent $z = 2$ for non-conserved dynamics [5]. For pure systems, this domain growth is possible even at zero-temperature because domain walls can still diffuse and annihilate. In the presence of quenched disorder however, the dynamics requires thermal activation, since exactly at zero temperature, the dynamics stops on the first encountered local minimum. Within the droplet scaling theory proposed both for spin-glasses [6, 7] and for directed polymers in random media [8], the dynamical barriers $B(L)$ grow as a power law of the spatial length L

$$B(L) \sim L^{\psi} u \tag{1}$$

with some barrier exponent $\psi > 0$, and where u is a random variable of order $O(1)$. The time $t(L)$ needed to go over this barrier by thermal activation then follows the activated form at small temperature $T = 1/\beta$

$$t(L) \simeq e^{\beta B(L)} = e^{\beta L^{\psi} u} \tag{2}$$

This means that the characteristic length-scale $L(t)$ associated to time t grows only logarithmically in time as

$$L(t) \sim \left(\frac{\ln t}{\beta} \right)^{\frac{1}{\psi}} \tag{3}$$

In the field of spin-glasses, this logarithmic behavior has remained controversial, both in numerical studies (see [9] in favor of activated dynamics and [10] in favor of power-law dynamics) and in experiments [11] because the dynamics is very slow both in Monte-Carlo simulations and in real life : as a consequence, the maximal equilibrated length L_{max} measured at the end of the dynamics is usually rather small, so that various fits of the data are possible. Besides the scaling of the growing length $L(t)$, many studies have also been devoted to more complicated temperature cycling experiments that display rejuvenation and memory [1–4]. The important point for the present discussion is that these phenomena require some hierarchical organization of valleys within valleys, where the rejuvenation due to short length scales does not destroy the memory of large length scales which are effectively frozen.

This expected hierarchical organization of valleys within valleys in space-time strongly suggests that renormalization is the most appropriate tool to characterize the dynamics of disordered systems. In this direction, the real-space Strong Disorder Renormalization (see [12] for a review) has given a lot of asymptotic exact results for the dynamics of many classical disordered models, including in particular random walks in random media [13–21], trap models [22], classical spin chains [23], reaction-diffusion [24, 25], directed percolation [26], zero-range processes [27], exclusion processes [28], contact processes [29], coupled oscillators [30] and elastic networks [31]. The Strong Disorder Renormalization has also been formulated in configuration space for the master equation of arbitrary disordered models [32]. Another real-space renormalization procedure has also been introduced to study the largest relaxation time for pure and random ferromagnets in various geometries [33].

In the present paper, we consider long-ranged spin-glasses and study the dynamics near zero temperature via a block renormalization in real space. This standard block renormalization is the simplest framework to take into account the hierarchy of the long-ranged couplings and to obtain simple renormalization rules. This procedure is thus different from the Strong Disorder Renormalization mentioned above, where the smallest barriers are decimated recursively. However, when dynamical barriers $B(L)$ grow as a power of the spatial length L (Eq. 1), we expect that the decimation of the smallest barriers or the decimation of the smallest lengths should be able to describe the same physics, i.e. more precisely should yield the same typical exponents (see [34] where the comparison between Strong Disorder renormalization and Block renormalization is discussed in detail for disorder quantum models governed by Infinite disordered Fixed Points).

The paper is organized as follows. The long-ranged spin-glass models are described in section II, together with the Metropolis dynamics on which we focus. In section III, we recall the zero-temperature real-space renormalization to construct the two ground-states [35]. In section IV, we derive the basic renormalization rule for the Metropolis dynamics near zero temperature. In section V, we describe how this basic renormalization rule can be used to construct explicitly the full hierarchy of relaxation times in each given disordered sample. Finally in section VI, we analyze the properties of the probability distributions of dynamical barriers. Our conclusions are summarized in section VII.

II. MODELS AND NOTATIONS

In real spin-glasses with RKKY interactions, the coupling $J(r)$ between two spins separated by a distance r decays only as a power-law of the distance and is of random sign

$$J^{RKKY}(r) \simeq \pm \frac{1}{r^3} \tag{4}$$

So besides the short-ranged spin-glasses that have been most studied, it is also important to better understand long-ranged spin-glasses. In the presence of power-law interactions, the dimensionality of the space is not such an essential parameter as for the short-ranged case, so that most studied have focused on the one-dimensional long-ranged spin-glass as we now recall.

A. One-dimensional Long-Ranged Spin-glass

The one-dimensional Long-Ranged Spin-glass of L classical spins $S_i = \pm 1$ is defined by the energy function

$$U(S_1, ..., S_L) = - \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq L} J_{ij} S_i S_j \tag{5}$$

where the random couplings decay as a power-law of the distance $r = |j = i|$ with exponent σ

$$\begin{aligned} J_{ij} &= \Delta(|j-i|)\epsilon_{ij} \\ \Delta(r) &= \frac{1}{r^\sigma} \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

The ϵ_{ij} are independent identical $O(1)$ random variables of zero mean.

The Gaussian distribution

$$L_2(\epsilon) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{4\pi}} e^{-\frac{\epsilon^2}{4}} \tag{7}$$

has been the most studied in the literature [36–53], but the Lévy symmetric stable laws $L_\mu(\epsilon)$ of index $1 < \mu \leq 2$ have also been considered [35]

$$L_\mu(\epsilon) = \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \frac{dk}{2\pi} e^{-ik\epsilon - |k|^\mu} \tag{8}$$

The Gaussian distribution of Eq. 7 corresponds to the particular case $\mu = 2$. The other cases $1 < \mu < 2$ correspond to distributions with the following power-law tail

$$\begin{aligned} L_{1<\mu<2}(\epsilon) &\underset{\epsilon \to \pm\infty}{\simeq} \frac{A_\mu}{|\epsilon|^{1+\mu}} \\ A_\mu &\equiv \frac{\Gamma(1+\mu)}{\pi} \sin\left(\frac{\pi\mu}{2}\right) \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

In the field of spin-glasses, the case of Lévy distributions of the couplings has been already studied for the mean-field fully connected geometry [54–58] and for the nearest-neighbor model in dimension $d = 3$ [59].

In this paper, we will only consider the region

$$\sigma > \frac{1}{\mu} \tag{10}$$

(in particular $\sigma > \frac{1}{2}$ for the Gaussian case $\mu = 2$) where the ground-state energy is extensive in the number of spins (see [35] for more details).

Within the droplet scaling theory [6, 7], the most important property of the spin-glass phase is the droplet exponent θ that governs the scaling of the renormalized random coupling J_L with the length L

$$J_L \propto L^{\theta} \tag{11}$$

Whereas in short-ranged spin-glasses, the droplet exponent $\theta^{SR}(d)$ is non-trivial for dimensions $d > 1$, the droplet exponent for Gaussian long-ranged spin-glasses is known exactly to be $\theta^{LR}(d, \sigma) = d - \sigma$ [7, 37] in the region where $\theta^{LR}(d, \sigma) > \theta^{SR}(d)$. In particular in dimension $d = 1$, where the short-ranged droplet exponent is known to be $\theta^{SR}(d = 1) = -1$, the droplet exponent of the Gaussian long-ranged spin-glass is known exactly [7, 37]

$$\begin{aligned} \theta^{LR}_{Gauss}(d = 1, \sigma) &= 1 - \sigma \qquad \text{for } \frac{1}{2} < \sigma < 2 \\ \theta^{LR}_{Gauss}(d = 1, \sigma) &= \theta^{SR}(d = 1) = -1 \quad \text{for } 2 \leq \sigma \end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

Note however that the numerical measures via Monte-Carlo on sizes $L \leq 256$ (see Fig. 13 and Table III of [38]) are not a clear support of this theoretical expectation, in particular in the region $\sigma \to (1/2)^+$ where the theoretical prediction of Eq. 12 corresponds to $\theta^{LR}(d = 1, \sigma \to (1/2)^+) \to (1/2)^-$, whereas the numerical results of [38] display a saturation around $\theta \simeq 0.3$. The origin of this discrepancy has remained unclear over the years. The interpretation proposed in [38] is that Eq. 12 is nevertheless exact in the whole region $\frac{1}{2} < \sigma < 2$ as predicted by the theoretical derivations [7, 37], and despite their numerical results [38]. Another interpretation could be that the saturation seen in the numerics is meaningful, and that Eq. 12 is valid only in the region $\frac{2}{3} < \sigma < 2$.

For the Lévy distribution of index $1 < \mu < 2$, the generalization reads [35]

$$\begin{aligned} \theta^{LR}_{\mu}(d = 1, \sigma) &= \frac{2}{\mu} - \sigma \qquad \text{for } \frac{1}{\mu} < \sigma < \frac{2}{\mu} + 1 \\ \theta^{LR}_{\mu}(d = 1, \sigma) &= \theta^{SR}(d = 1) = -1 \quad \text{for } \sigma > \frac{2}{\mu} + 1 \end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

In this paper, we will only consider the region of positive droplet exponent

$$\theta^{LR}_{\mu}(d = 1, \sigma) = \frac{2}{\mu} - \sigma > 0 \qquad \text{for } \frac{1}{\mu} < \sigma < \frac{2}{\mu} \tag{14}$$

where the spin-glass phase exists in a finite region of temperature (i.e. the region $\frac{1}{2} < \sigma < 1$ for the Gaussian case).

B. Related Dyson hierarchical Spin-glass

In the field of long ranged models, it is very useful to consider their Dyson hierarchical analogs, where real space renormalization procedures are usually easier to define as a consequence of the hierarchical structure. The Dyson hierarchical ferromagnetic Ising model [60] has been much studied by both mathematicians [61–64] and physicists [65–69]. More recently, various Dyson hierarchical versions of disordered systems have been considered, in particular Anderson localization models [72–79], random fields Ising models [70, 71] and spin-glasses [80–84].

The Dyson hierarchical spin-glass model of $L = 2^N$ spins is defined by the following recurrence for the energy function [81–84]

$$\begin{aligned} U_N(S_1, S_2, ..., S_{2^N}) &= U^{(a)}_{N-1}(S_1, S_2, ..., S_{2^{N-1}}) + U^{(b)}_{N-1}(S_{2^{N-1}+1}, S_{2^{N-1}+2}, ..., S_{2^N}) \\ &\quad - \sum_{i=1}^{2^{N-1}} \sum_{j=2^{N-1}+1}^{2^N} J_{N-1}(i, j) S_i S_j \end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

(where the notation $U_{N-1}^{(a)}$ and $U_{N-1}^{(b)}$ means that these two energies are two independent realizations for the two half-systems before the introduction of the couplings of the second line). The first terms for $N = 1$ and $N = 2$ reads

$$\begin{aligned} U_1(S_1, S_2) &= -J_0(1,2)S_1S_2 \\ U_2(S_1, S_2, S_3, S_4) &= -J_0(1,2)S_1S_2 - J_0(3,4)S_3S_4 \\ &\quad -J_1(1,3)S_1S_3 - J_1(1,4)S_1S_4 - J_1(2,3)S_2S_3 - J_1(2,4)S_2S_4 \end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

At generation n, associated to the length scale $L_n = 2^n$, the couplings $J_n(i,j)$ read

$$J_n(i,j) = \Delta_n \epsilon_{ij} \tag{17}$$

where ϵ_{ij} are independent random variables of zero mean as in Eq. 6, distributed with the Gaussian (Eq 7) or the Lévy law (Eq. 8). At generation n, the characteristic scale Δ_n is chosen to decay exponentially with the number n of generations, in order to mimic the power-law decay of Eq. 6 with respect to the length scale $L_n = 2^n$

$$\Delta_n = 2^{-n\sigma} = \frac{1}{L_n^\sigma} \tag{18}$$

Then one expects that many scaling properties will be the same. In particular, the condition for the extensivity of the energy is the same as Eq. 10, and in the interesting region of positive droplet exponent where the spin-glass phase exists in a finite region of temperature, the droplet exponent is given by the same formula as Eq. 14 (see [35] for more details).

C. Master Equation for the Metropolis dynamics

We consider the long-ranged spin-glass of $L = 2^N$ spins of Eq. 5 or of its Dyson analog of Eq. 15. There are

$$\mathcal{N} = 2^L = 2^{2^N} \tag{19}$$

possibles configurations $\mathcal{C} = (S_1, S_2, ..., S_L)$. The stochastic relaxational dynamics towards the Boltzmann equilibrium

$$P_{eq}(\mathcal{C}) = \frac{e^{-\beta U(\mathcal{C})}}{Z} \tag{20}$$

where Z is the partition function

$$Z = \sum_{\mathcal{C}} e^{-\beta U(\mathcal{C})} \tag{21}$$

can be described by the master equation for the probability $P_t(\mathcal{C})$ to be in configuration $\mathcal{C}$ at time t

$$\frac{dP_t(\mathcal{C})}{dt} = \sum_{\mathcal{C}'} P_t(\mathcal{C}') W(\mathcal{C}' \to \mathcal{C}) - P_t(\mathcal{C}) \left[\sum_{\mathcal{C}'} W(\mathcal{C} \to \mathcal{C}') \right] \tag{22}$$

where the transition rates W satisfy the detailed balance property

$$e^{-\beta U(\mathcal{C})} W(\mathcal{C} \to \mathcal{C}') = e^{-\beta U(\mathcal{C}')} W(\mathcal{C}' \to \mathcal{C}) \tag{23}$$

In the following, we focus on the Metropolis single-spin-flip dynamics : the configuration $\mathcal{C} = (S_1, S_2, ..., S_L)$ containing L spins is connected only to the L configurations $\mathcal{C}_k = (S_1, S_2, ., -S_k, .., S_L)$ obtained by the flip of the single spin $S_k \to -S_k$ with the Metropolis rate

$$W(\mathcal{C} \to \mathcal{C}_k) = \frac{1}{\tau_0} \min \left[1, e^{-\beta [U(\mathcal{C}_k) - U(\mathcal{C})]} \right] \tag{24}$$

where τ_0 is the characteristic time to attempt a spin-flip : so a spin-flip that decreases the energy $\Delta U = U(\mathcal{C}_k) - U(\mathcal{C}) < 0$ has the rate $\frac{1}{\tau_0}$, whereas a spin-flip that increases the energy $\Delta U = U(\mathcal{C}_k) - U(\mathcal{C}) > 0$, has the rate $\frac{1}{\tau_0} e^{-\beta \Delta U}$.

D. Relaxation spectrum

As is well known (see for instance the textbooks [85–87]), the non-symmetric master Eq. 22 can be transformed via the change of variable

$$P_t(\mathcal{C}) \equiv e^{-\frac{\beta}{2}U(\mathcal{C})}\psi_t(\mathcal{C}) = e^{-\frac{\beta}{2}U(\mathcal{C})} < \mathcal{C}|\psi_t > \tag{25}$$

into the imaginary-time Schrödinger equation for the ket $|\psi_t >$

$$\frac{d}{dt}|\psi_t >= -H|\psi_t > \tag{26}$$

where the quantum Hamiltonian

$$\mathcal{H} = \sum_{\mathcal{C}} \epsilon\left(\mathcal{C}\right)|\mathcal{C}><\mathcal{C}| + \sum_{\mathcal{C},\mathcal{C}'} V(\mathcal{C},\mathcal{C}')|\mathcal{C}'><\mathcal{C}| \tag{27}$$

contains the symmetric hoppings (Eq 24)

$$\begin{aligned} V(\mathcal{C}\to\mathcal{C}_k) &= -\sqrt{W\left(\mathcal{C}\to\mathcal{C}_k\right)W\left(\mathcal{C}_k\to\mathcal{C}\right)} \\ &= -\frac{1}{\tau_0}e^{-\frac{\beta}{2}|U(\mathcal{C}_k)-U(\mathcal{C})|} = V(\mathcal{C}_k\to\mathcal{C}) \end{aligned} \tag{28}$$

and the on-site energies

$$\epsilon\left(\mathcal{C}\right) = \sum_{\mathcal{C}_k} W\left(\mathcal{C}\to\mathcal{C}_k\right) = \sum_{\mathcal{C}_k}\frac{1}{\tau_0}\min\left[1, e^{-\beta[U(\mathcal{C}_k)-U(\mathcal{C})]}\right] \tag{29}$$

In terms of the eigenvalues E_n and the associated normalized eigenvectors $|\psi_n >$ of the quantum Hamiltonian $\mathcal{H}$

$$\mathcal{H}|\psi_n > = E_n|\psi_n > \tag{30}$$

$$\sum_{\mathcal{C}}|\psi_n(\mathcal{C})|^2 = 1 \tag{31}$$

the evolution operator e^{-tH} can be expanded as

$$e^{-t\mathcal{H}} = \sum_n e^{-E_n t}|\psi_n><\psi_n| \tag{32}$$

so that the probability $P_t\left(\mathcal{C}|\mathcal{C}_0\right)$ to be in configuration $\mathcal{C}$ at t if one starts from the configuration $\mathcal{C}_0$ at time $t=0$ reads

$$P_t\left(\mathcal{C}|\mathcal{C}_0\right) = e^{-\frac{\beta}{2}[U(\mathcal{C})-U(\mathcal{C}_0)]} < \mathcal{C}|e^{-t\mathcal{H}}|\mathcal{C}_0 >= e^{-\frac{\beta}{2}[U(\mathcal{C})-U(\mathcal{C}_0)]}\sum_n e^{-E_n t}\psi_n(\mathcal{C})\psi_n^*(\mathcal{C}_0) \tag{33}$$

The quantum Hamiltonian $\mathcal{H}$ has the following well-known properties
(i) the ground state energy is $E_0 = 0$, and the corresponding eigenvector reads

$$|\psi_0 >= \sum_{\mathcal{C}}\frac{e^{-\frac{\beta}{2}U(\mathcal{C})}}{\sqrt{Z}}|\mathcal{C}> \tag{34}$$

the normalization $1/\sqrt{Z}$ coming from the quantum normalization of Eq. 31. This property ensures the convergence towards the Boltzmann equilibrium in Eq. 25 for any initial condition $\mathcal{C}_0$

$$P_t\left(\mathcal{C}|\mathcal{C}_0\right) \underset{t\to+\infty}{\simeq} e^{-\frac{\beta}{2}[U(\mathcal{C})-U(\mathcal{C}_0)]}\psi_0(\mathcal{C})\psi_0^*(\mathcal{C}_0) = \frac{e^{-\beta U(\mathcal{C})}}{Z} = P_{eq}(\mathcal{C}) \tag{35}$$

(ii) the other $(\mathcal{N}-1) = (2^L-1)$ (Eq 19) energies $E_n > 0$ determine the relaxation towards equilibrium. In particular, the lowest non-vanishing energy E_1 determines the largest relaxation time of the system

$$P_t\left(\mathcal{C}|\mathcal{C}_0\right) - P_{eq}(\mathcal{C}) \underset{t\to+\infty}{\simeq} e^{-E_1 t}e^{-\frac{\beta}{2}[U(\mathcal{C})-U(\mathcal{C}_0)]}\psi_1(\mathcal{C})\psi_1^*(\mathcal{C}_0) \tag{36}$$

This property allows to compute this largest relaxation time $1/E_1$ without simulating the dynamics by any method able to compute the first excited energy E_1 of the quantum Hamiltonian $\mathcal{H}$ [33, 52, 88]. In this paper, our goal is to construct the whole hierarchy of relaxation times via an appropriate real-space renormalization of the dynamics, but before we need a brief reminder on the real-space renormalization for the statics.

III. REMINDER ON THE RENORMALIZATION TO CONSTRUCT THE GROUND STATES [35]

As explained in detail in [35], a very simple real-space renormalization using blocks of two spins can be used for the energy function of the Long-Ranged spin-glass of Eq. 5 or of its Dyson analog of Eq. 15. The idea is that the two ground states of the internal energy of each block

$$U^{int}_{2i-1,2i} = -J_{2i-1,2i} S_{2i-1} S_{2i} \tag{37}$$

can be parametrized by the renormalized spin

$$\begin{aligned} (S^R_{2i} = +) &= (S_{2i-1} = \mathrm{sgn} J_{2i-1,2i}, S_{2i} = +) \\ (S^R_{2i} = -) &= (S_{2i-1} = -\mathrm{sgn} J_{2i-1,2i}, S_{2i} = -) \end{aligned} \tag{38}$$

The renormalized coupling between two renormalized spins (S^R_{2i}, S^R_{2j}) reads

$$\begin{aligned} J^{(1)}_{2i,2j} &= J_{2i,2m} + \mathrm{sgn}(J_{2i-1,2i})\mathrm{sgn}(J_{2j-1,2j}) J_{2i-1,2m-1} \\ &+ \mathrm{sgn}(J_{2i-1,2i}) J_{2i-1,2j} + \mathrm{sgn}(J_{2j-1,2j}) J_{2i,2j-1} \end{aligned} \tag{39}$$

The Gaussian distribution of Eq. 7 or the symmetric Lévy stable laws of Eq. 8 are stable for this renormalization rule, so that one only needs to follow the renormalization of the characteristic scale Δ (see [35] for more details).

For the Dyson model, this leads to the very simple result that the characteristic scale $\Delta^{(p)}_n$ of the couplings of generation n after $p \leq n$ renormalization steps reads in terms of the initial scale Δ_n of Eq. 18

$$\Delta^{(p)}_n = \left(4^{\frac{1}{\mu}}\right)^p \Delta_n = L_p^{\theta_\mu(\sigma)} \left(\frac{L_p}{L_n}\right)^\sigma \tag{40}$$

in terms of the associated length $L_p = 2^p$ and $L_n = 2^n$, and of the droplet exponent

$$\theta_\mu(\sigma) = \frac{2}{\mu} - \sigma \tag{41}$$

of Eq 14. For the Long-ranged model of Eq. 5, the renormalization is somewhat heavier to write upon iteration, but yields the same droplet exponent of Eq. 41 in the region where it is positive (Eq 14) on which we focus here. We refer to [35] for more details and consequences on the distribution of the ground state energy, and we turn to the dynamics.

IV. ELEMENTARY RENORMALIZATION STEP FOR THE METROPOLIS DYNAMICS

In this section, we derive the basic renormalization rule for the Metropolis single-spin-flip dynamics in the limit of small temperature.

A. Master equation associated to a block of two spins

The elementary renormalization step concerns a block of two spins, say (S_1, S_2), with the internal energy

$$U^{int}_{1,2}(S_1, S_2) = -J_{1,2} S_1 S_2 \tag{42}$$

and with the following Master equation between the four possibles configurations $(S_1 = \pm, S_2 = \pm)$

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dP_t(S_1, S_2)}{dt} &= P_t(-S_1, S_2) W((-S_1, S_2) \to (S_1, S_2)) \\ &+ P_t(S_1, -S_2) W((S_1, -S_2) \to (S_1, S_2)) \\ &- P_t(S_1, S_2) \left[W((S_1, S_2) \to (-S_1, S_2)) + W((S_1, S_2) \to (S_1, -S_2)) \right] \end{aligned} \tag{43}$$

To iterate the RG procedure, we will need to consider the slightly generalized Metropolis dynamics of Eq. 24, where each spin S_k has its own characteristic time τ_k to attempt a spin-flip

$$W(\mathcal{C} \to \mathcal{C}_k) = \frac{1}{\tau_k} \min\left[1, e^{-\beta[U(\mathcal{C}_k) - U(\mathcal{C})]}\right] \tag{44}$$

Besides the two ground-states parametrized by the renormalized spin (Eq. 38)

$$\begin{aligned}(S_R=+) &= (S_1=\mathrm{sgn}J_{12}, S_2=+)\\ (S_R=-) &= (S_1=-\mathrm{sgn}J_{12}, -S_2=-)\end{aligned} \tag{45}$$

we need here to introduce also the two excited states

$$\begin{aligned}(E=+) &= (S_1=-\mathrm{sgn}J_{12}, S_2=+)\\ (E=-) &= (S_1=\mathrm{sgn}J_{12}, -S_2=-)\end{aligned} \tag{46}$$

The energies of these configurations are (Eq. 42)

$$\begin{aligned}U(S_R=+) &= U(S_R=-) = -|J_{12}|\\ U(E=+) &= U(E=-) = +|J_{12}|\end{aligned} \tag{47}$$

whereas the Metropolis transition rates between them read (Eq. 44)

$$\begin{aligned}W\left((S_R=+)\to(E=+)\right) &= \frac{1}{\tau_1}e^{-2\beta|J_{12}|}\\ W\left((S_R=+)\to(E=-)\right) &= \frac{1}{\tau_2}e^{-2\beta|J_{12}|}\\ W\left((S_R=-)\to(E=+)\right) &= \frac{1}{\tau_2}e^{-2\beta|J_{12}|}\\ W\left((S_R=-)\to(E=-)\right) &= \frac{1}{\tau_1}e^{-2\beta|J_{12}|}\\ W\left((E=+)\to(S_R=+)\right) &= \frac{1}{\tau_1}\\ W\left((E=+)\to(S_R=-)\right) &= \frac{1}{\tau_2}\\ W\left((E=-)\to(S_R=+)\right) &= \frac{1}{\tau_2}\\ W\left((E=-)\to(S_R=-)\right) &= \frac{1}{\tau_1}\end{aligned} \tag{48}$$

So that the Master equation of Eq. 43 now reads

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{dP_t(S_R=+)}{dt} &= -\left(\frac{1}{\tau_1}+\frac{1}{\tau_2}\right)e^{-2\beta|J_{12}|}P_t(S_R=+)+\frac{1}{\tau_1}P_t(E=+)+\frac{1}{\tau_2}P_t(E=-)\\ \frac{dP_t(S_R=-)}{dt} &= -\left(\frac{1}{\tau_1}+\frac{1}{\tau_2}\right)e^{-2\beta|J_{12}|}P_t(S_R=-)+\frac{1}{\tau_2}P_t(E=+)+\frac{1}{\tau_1}P_t(E=-)\\ \frac{dP_t(E=+)}{dt} &= -\left(\frac{1}{\tau_1}+\frac{1}{\tau_2}\right)P_t(E=+)+\frac{1}{\tau_1}e^{-2\beta|J_{12}|}P_t(S_R=+)+\frac{1}{\tau_2}e^{-2\beta|J_{12}|}P_t(S_R=-)\\ \frac{dP_t(E=-)}{dt} &= -\left(\frac{1}{\tau_1}+\frac{1}{\tau_2}\right)P_t(E=-)+\frac{1}{\tau_2}e^{-2\beta|J_{12}|}P_t(S_R=+)+\frac{1}{\tau_1}e^{-2\beta|J_{12}|}P_t(S_R=-)\end{aligned} \tag{49}$$

B. Renormalization of the Master equation

The renormalization of master equations containing rapid and slow modes has for goal the elimination of the rapid modes in order to obtain an effective dynamics for the slow modes. The explicit renormalization rules for arbitrary master equations have been discussed in detail in [32, 89]. So here we simply describe directly how it can be applied to the specific case of Eq. 49.

In the limit of small temperature $\beta|J_{12}| \gg 1$, the Arrhenius factor $e^{\beta|J_{12}|}$ is huge so that the effective slow dynamics between the two ground-states configurations $S_R = \pm$ can be found by eliminating the excited states $E = \pm$ that rapidly disintegrate. We may thus consider that these two excited states are in quasi-equilibrium with respect to the

slow modes, so in practice we may set $\frac{dP_t(E=+)}{dt} \simeq 0$ and $\frac{dP_t(E=+)}{dt} \simeq 0$ in the two last equations of the system (Eq. 49) that yield

$$\begin{aligned} P_t(E=+) &\simeq e^{-2\beta|J_{12}|} \ \frac{\frac{1}{\tau_1}P_t(S_R=+)+\frac{1}{\tau_2}P_t(S_R=-)}{\frac{1}{\tau_1}+\frac{1}{\tau_2}} \\ P_t(E=-) &\simeq e^{-2\beta|J_{12}|} \ \frac{\frac{1}{\tau_2}P_t(S_R=+)\frac{1}{\tau_1}P_t(S_R=-)}{\frac{1}{\tau_1}+\frac{1}{\tau_2}} \end{aligned} \tag{50}$$

Plugging these expressions into the two first equations of the system (Eq. 49) yields the effective master equation for the slow modes

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dP_t(S_R=+)}{dt} &= -\frac{1}{\tau_R}P_t(S_R=+)+\frac{1}{\tau_R}P_t(S_R=-) \\ \frac{dP_t(S_R=-)}{dt} &= -\frac{1}{\tau_R}P_t(S_R=-)+\frac{1}{\tau_R}P_t(S_R=+) \end{aligned} \tag{51}$$

with the following renormalized flip-rate for the renormalized spin S_R

$$\tau_R = e^{2\beta|J_{12}|}\frac{\tau_1+\tau_2}{2} \tag{52}$$

V. FULL HIERARCHY OF RELAXATION TIMES IN EACH DISORDERED SAMPLE

In this section, we explain how the basic renormalization rule of Eq. 52 for the Metropolis dynamics in the limit of small temperature can be used to construct explicitly the full hierarchy of relaxation times in each given disordered sample. For notational convenience, we have chosen to use here the Dyson notation for the couplings (Eq 15), but the case of the long-ranged model of Eq. 5 can be studied along the same lines.

A. First RG step : Relaxation towards local equilibrium on each of the $\frac{L}{2}$ blocks of two spins

For the initial system of $L = 2^N$ spins S_i, we first consider separately the $\frac{L}{2} = 2^{N-1}$ blocks of two spins (S_{2i-1}, S_{2i}) linked by couplings of the zero generation $J_0(2i-1, 2i)$.

(i) on the time-scale τ_0, the two excited states of the block (Eq. 53)

$$\begin{aligned} (E_{2i}^{R1}=+) &= (S_{2i-1} = -\mathrm{sgn}J_0(2i-1,2i), S_{2i}=+) \\ (E_{2i}^{R1}=-) &= (S_{2i-1} = \mathrm{sgn}J_0(2i-1,2i), S_{2i}=-) \end{aligned} \tag{53}$$

disintegrate towards one of the two ground states of the block parametrized by the renormalized spin

$$\begin{aligned} (S_{2i}^{R1}=+) &= (S_{2i-1} = \mathrm{sgn}J_0(2i-1,2i), S_{2i}=+) \\ (S_{2i}^{R1}=-) &= (S_{2i-1} = -\mathrm{sgn}J_0(2i-1,2i), S_{2i}=-) \end{aligned} \tag{54}$$

(ii) The convergence towards the local equilibrium between the two ground states of Eq. 54 is characterized by the renormalized effective flipping time for the renormalized spin S_{2i}^{R1} (Eq. 52 for the special case $\tau_1 = \tau_2 = \tau_0$)

$$\tau_{S_{2i}^{R1}} = \tau_0 e^{2\beta|J_0(2i-1,2i)|} \tag{55}$$

For the future dynamics, we may now completely forget the excited states of Eq. 53, and keep only the renormalized spins of Eq. 54, that are characterized by their disorder-dependent flipping times of Eq. 55. Two renormalized spins $(S_{2i}^{R1}, S_{2j}^{R1})$ are now coupled by the renormalized couplings of Eq 39 for $n \geq 1$

$$\begin{aligned} J_n^{(R1)}(2i,2j) &= J_n(2i,2j) + \mathrm{sgn}[J_0(2i-1,2i)\mathrm{sgn}(J_0(2j-1,2j)]J_n(2i-1,2j-1) \\ &+\mathrm{sgn}[J_0(2i-1,2i)]J_n(2i-1,2j) + \mathrm{sgn}[J_0(2j-1,2j)]J_n(2i,2j-1) \end{aligned} \tag{56}$$

B. Second RG step : Relaxation towards local equilibrium on each of the $\frac{L}{4}$ blocks of four spins

We now consider separately the $\frac{L}{4}=2^{N-2}$ blocks of four initial spins $(S_{4i-3},S_{4i-2},S_{4i-1},S_{4i})$ i.e. of two renormalized spins $(S^{R1}_{4i-2},S^{R1}_{4i})$ linked by renormalized couplings of the first generation $J_1^{R1}(2i-2,2i)$ that read in terms of the original couplings (Eq. 56)

$$\begin{aligned} J_1^{(R1)}(4i-2,4i) &= J_1(4i-2,4i)+\mathrm{sgn}[J_0(4i-3,4i-2)\mathrm{sgn}(J_0(4i-1,4i)]J_1(4i-3,4i-1) \\ &+\mathrm{sgn}[J_0(4i-3,4i-2)]J_1(4i-3,4i)+\mathrm{sgn}[J_0(4i-1,4i)]J_1(4i-2,4i-1) \end{aligned} \tag{57}$$

The convergence towards the local equilibrium between the two corresponding ground states parametrized by the renormalized spin of the second generation $R2$

$$\begin{aligned} (S^{R2}_{4i}=+) &= (S^{R1}_{4i-2}=\mathrm{sgn}J_1^{(R1)}(4i-2,4i),S^{R1}_{4i}=+) \\ (S^{R2}_{4i}=-) &= (S^{R1}_{4i-2}=-\mathrm{sgn}J_1^{(R1)}(4i-2,4i),-S^{R1}_{4i}=-) \end{aligned} \tag{58}$$

after the elimination of the two excited states of the second generation $R2$

$$\begin{aligned} (E^{R2}_{4i}=+) &= (S^{R1}_{4i-2}=-\mathrm{sgn}J_1^{(R1)}(4i-2,4i),S^{R1}_{4i}=+) \\ (E^{R2}_{4i}=-) &= (S^{R1}_{4i-2}=\mathrm{sgn}J_1^{(R1)}(4i-2,4i),S^{R1}_{4i}=-) \end{aligned} \tag{59}$$

is governed by the effective renormalized flipping time (Eq. 52 and Eq. 55)

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_{S^{R2}_{4i}} &= e^{2\beta|J_1^{(R1)}(4i-2,4i))|}\frac{\tau_{S^{R1}_{4i-2}}+\tau_{S^{R1}_{4i}}}{2} \\ &= \frac{\tau_0}{2}e^{2\beta|J_1^{(1)}(4i-2,4i))|}\left[e^{2\beta|J_0(4i-3,4i-2)|}+e^{2\beta|J_0(4i-1,4i)|}\right] \end{aligned} \tag{60}$$

Two renormalized spins $(S^{R2}_{4i},S^{R2}_{4j})$ of the second generation are now coupled by the renormalized couplings of Eq 39 for $n\geq 2$

$$\begin{aligned} J_n^{(R2)}(4i,4j) &= J_n^{(R1)}(4i,4j)+\mathrm{sgn}[J_1^{(R1)}(4i-2,4i)\mathrm{sgn}(J_1^{(R1)}(4j-2,4j)]J_n^{(R1)}(4i-2,4j-2) \\ &+\mathrm{sgn}[J_1^{(R1)}(4i-2,4i)]J_n^{(R1)}(4i-2,4j)+\mathrm{sgn}[J_1^{(R1)}(4j-2,4j)]J_n^{(R1)}(4i,4j-2) \end{aligned} \tag{61}$$

C. Last RG step : Relaxation towards the equilibrium for the whole sample of $L=2^N$ spins

It is now clear how the renormalization procedure has to be iterated up to the last N-th RG step, where the two ground states of the full sample are parametrized by the single renormalized spin of generation RN

$$\begin{aligned} (S^{RN}_{2^N}=+) &= (S^{R(N-1)}_{2^{N-1}}=\mathrm{sgn}J_{N-1}^{(R(N-1))}(2^{N-1},2^N),S^{R(N-1)}_{2^N}=+) \\ (S^{RN}_{2^N}=-) &= (S^{R1}_{2^{N-1}}=-\mathrm{sgn}J_{N-1}^{(R(N-1))}(2^{N-1},2^N),S^{R(N-1)}_{2^N}=-) \end{aligned} \tag{62}$$

The convergence towards the equilibrium of the whole sample is then governed by the effective renormalized flipping time (Eq. 52)

$$\tau_{S^{RN}_{2^N}} = e^{2\beta|J_{N-1}^{(R(N-1))}(2^{N-1},2^N))|}\frac{\tau_{S^{R(N-1)}_{2^{N-1}}}+\tau_{S^{R(N-1)}_{2^N}}}{2} \tag{63}$$

Note that the recurrence of Eq. 63 is somewhat similar to the recursions concerning the partition functions of Derrida's Generalized Random Energy Models [90] or of the Dyson hierarchical Random Energy Model [91].

The contribution of the last renormalized coupling $|J_{N-1}^{(R(N-1))}(2^{N-1},2^N))|$ in Eq. 63 grows with respect to the length $L_{N-1}=2^{N-1}$ with the droplet exponent $\theta_\mu(\sigma)$ (Eq. 40)

$$|J_{N-1}^{(R(N-1))}(2^{N-1},2^N))|\propto\Delta_{N-1}^{(N-1)} = L_{N-1}^{\theta_\mu(\sigma)} \tag{64}$$

so that the dynamical exponent ψ introduced in Eqs 1 and 2 satisfies the usual bound [7]

$$\psi\geq\theta \tag{65}$$

as it should. To better understand the contributions of all other generations on the final relaxation time, we analyze the probability distribution of dynamical barriers in the next section.

VI. STATISTICS OF DYNAMICAL BARRIERS

Since the recurrence of Eq. 63 on the relaxation times has been derived near zero-temperature, it is convenient to focus now on the corresponding dynamical barriers $B(L)$ associated to the various lengths L (Eqs 1 and 2).

A. Recurrence on dynamical barriers

In the present real-space renormalization procedure, the possible lengths are $L_n = 2^n$. For $n = 1$ corresponding to the length $L_1 = 2$, the relaxation times of Eq. 55 correspond to the dynamical barriers

$$B_{2i}^{R1} \equiv \lim_{\beta \to +\infty} \left(\frac{\ln \tau_{S_{2i}^{R1}}}{\beta} \right) = 2|J_0(2i-1, 2i)| \tag{66}$$

Since the coupling $J_0(2i-1, 2i) = \Delta_0 \epsilon_{2i-1,2i}$ have for characteristic scale $\Delta_0 = 1$ (Eq. 18) and since the $\epsilon_{2i-1,2i}$ are distributed with the Lévy stable law of index $1 < \mu \leq 2$ (Eqs 7 or 8), the probability distribution of the barriers B^{R1} reads for B^{R1}

$$P_{R1}(B^{R1}) = 2 L_\mu \left(\frac{B^{R1}}{2} \right) \tag{67}$$

Then the recurrence of Eq. 63 for relaxation times yields that the dynamical barriers associated to the length $L_n = 2^n$

$$B^{Rn} \equiv \lim_{\beta \to +\infty} \left(\frac{\ln \tau_{S^{Rn}}}{\beta} \right) \tag{68}$$

satisfy the recurrence

$$B^{R(n+1)} = 2|J_n^{(n)}| + \max \left[B_a^{R(n)}, B_b^{R(n)} \right] \tag{69}$$

in terms of two statistically independent barriers $B_a^{R(n)}$ and $\mathcal{B}_b^{R(n)}$ of the generation $R(n)$, and of the renormalized coupling $J_n^{(n)} = \Delta_n^{(n)} \epsilon$ with the characteristic scale (Eq. 40)

$$\Delta_n^{(n)} = 2^{n \theta_\mu(\sigma)} \tag{70}$$

in terms of the droplet exponent $\theta_\mu(\sigma)$, and where ϵ is distributed with the Lévy stable law of index $1 < \mu \leq 2$ (Eqs 7 or 8). As a consequence, the probability distributions of dynamical barriers satisfy the recurrence

$$\begin{aligned} P_{R(n+1)}(B^{R(n+1)}) &= \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} d\epsilon L_\mu(\epsilon) \int_0^{+\infty} dB_a^{R(n)} P_{R(n)}(B_a^{R(n)}) \int_0^{+\infty} dB_b^{R(n)} P_{R(n)}(B_b^{R(n)}) \\ &\quad \delta \left[B^{Rn} - \left(2\Delta_n^{(n)} |\epsilon| + \max \left[B_a^{R(n)}, \mathcal{B}_b^{R(n)} \right] \right) \right] \\ &= 4 \int_0^{+\infty} d\epsilon L_\mu(\epsilon) \int_0^{+\infty} dB_a^{R(n)} P_{R(n)}(B_a^{R(n)}) \int_0^{B_a^{R(n)}} dB_b^{R(n)} P_{R(n)}(B_b^{R(n)}) \\ &\quad \delta \left[B^{Rn} - \left(2\Delta_n^{(n)} \epsilon + B_a^{R(n)} \right) \right] \end{aligned} \tag{71}$$

with the initial condition of Eq. 67. So it is clear that the probability distribution of dynamical barriers will keep the same type of asymptotic tail as L_μ. It is thus convenient now to discuss separately the Gaussian case $\mu = 2$ and the Lévy cases $1 < \mu < 2$ displaying power-law tails.

B. Analysis of the barrier distribution for the Gaussian case $\mu = 2$

In the Gaussian case $\mu = 2$, where the kernel L_μ of Eq. 71 is Gaussian (Eq. 7), Eq. 71 reads

$$\begin{aligned} P_{R(n+1)}(B^{R(n+1)}) &= 2 \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}} \int_0^{+\infty} d\epsilon e^{-\frac{\epsilon^2}{4}} \int_0^{+\infty} dB_a^{R(n)} P_{R(n)}(B_a^{R(n)}) \int_0^{B_a^{R(n)}} dB_b^{R(n)} P_{R(n)}(B_b^{R(n)}) \\ &\quad \delta \left[B^{Rn} - \left(2\Delta_n^{(n)} \epsilon + B_a^{R(n)} \right) \right] \end{aligned} \tag{72}$$

with the Gaussian initial condition (Eq. 67)

$$P_{R1}(B^{R1}) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}} e^{-\frac{1}{4}\left(\frac{B^{R1}}{2}\right)^2} \tag{73}$$

As a consequence, the probability distribution of barriers will keep the same type of tail

$$P_{Rn}(B^{Rn}) \underset{B^{Rn}\to+\infty}{\propto} e^{-\frac{1}{4}\left(\frac{B^{Rn}}{\Gamma_n}\right)^2} \tag{74}$$

where Γ_n is the appropriate scale governing the decay at infinity. A saddle point evaluation of Eq. 71 yields the following recurrence for the scale Γ_n

$$\Gamma_{n+1}^2 = 4(\Delta_n^{(n)})^2 + \Gamma_n^2 \tag{75}$$

with the initial condition $\Gamma_{n=1} = 2$ (Eq. 73) or equivalently $\Gamma_{n=0} = 0$. Using Eq. 70, one obtains

$$\Gamma_n^2 = 4\sum_{k=0}^{n-1}(\Delta_k^{(k)})^2 = 4\sum_{k=0}^{n-1}(2^{2\theta_2(\sigma)})^k = 4\frac{2^{2n\theta_2(\sigma)}-1}{2^{2\theta_2(\sigma)}-1} \tag{76}$$

For large n, we thus obtain that the characteristic scale Γ_n that governs the asymptotic decays of Eq. 74 grows with respect to the length $L_n = 2^n$ as

$$\Gamma_n \simeq \frac{2}{\sqrt{2^{2\theta_2(\sigma)}-1}} L_n^{\theta_2(\sigma)} \tag{77}$$

so that the dynamical exponent ψ introduced in Eq. 1 here coincides with the droplet exponent $\theta_2(\sigma)$ (Eq. 12)

$$\psi = \theta_2(\sigma) = 1 - \sigma \tag{78}$$

i.e. it saturates the bound $\psi \geq \theta$ of Eq. 65 [7], whereas in short-ranged Gaussian spin-glasses, one expects the strict inequality $\psi > \theta$ (see [92] and references therein).

C. Analysis of the barrier distribution for the Lévy cases $1 < \mu < 2$

In the Lévy cases $1 < \mu < 2$, both the kernel L_μ of Eq. 71 and the initial condition of Eq. 67 display the power-law decay of Eq. 9. As a consequence, it is clear that the probability distribution of barriers will also display the same power-law tail

$$P_{Rn}(B^{Rn}) \underset{B^{Rn}\to+\infty}{\propto} \frac{A_\mu}{B^{Rn}} \left(\frac{\Gamma_n}{B^{Rn}}\right)^\mu \tag{79}$$

where Γ_n is the appropriate scale governing the decay at infinity. The asymptotic analysis of the iteration of Eq. 71 yields the recurrence

$$\Gamma_{n+1}^\mu = (2\Delta_n^{(n)})^\mu + 2\Gamma_n^\mu \tag{80}$$

with the initial condition $\Gamma_{n=0} = 0$. Using Eq. 70, one obtains

$$\Gamma_n^\mu = \sum_{k=0}^{n-1}(2\Delta_k^{(k)})^\mu 2^{n-1-k} = 2^{\mu+n-1}\sum_{k=0}^{n-1}\left(2^{\mu\theta_\mu(\sigma)-1}\right)^k = 2^{\mu+n-1}\frac{2^{n(\mu\theta_\mu(\sigma)-1)}-1}{2^{\mu\theta_\mu(\sigma)-1}-1} \tag{81}$$

In the region of parameters that we consider (Eq. 14), it turns out that $(\mu\theta_\mu(\sigma)-1) = 1-\mu\sigma < 0$, and the characteristic scale Γ_n grows with respect to the length $L_n = 2^n$ as

$$\Gamma_n \simeq \frac{2^{1-\frac{1}{\mu}}}{\left(1-2^{\mu\theta_\mu(\sigma)-1}\right)^{\frac{1}{\mu}}} L_n^{\frac{1}{\mu}} \tag{82}$$

so that the dynamical exponent ψ introduced in Eq. 1 here does not coincide with the droplet exponent $\theta_\mu(\sigma) = \frac{2}{\mu} - \sigma$ but is bigger

$$\psi = \frac{1}{\mu} \tag{83}$$

This value can be understood by the simple following scaling argument concerning only the largest barrier $B^{R1}_{max}(L)$ among the L barriers B^{R1} of the smallest scale (Eq. 66) distributed with a power-law tail

$$\frac{1}{L} \propto \int_{B_{max}(L)}^{+\infty} \frac{dB^{R1}}{(B^{R1})^{1+\mu}} \propto \frac{1}{(B^{R1}_{max}(L))^{\mu}} \tag{84}$$

leading to $B^{R1}_{max}(L) \propto L^{\frac{1}{\mu}}$. It seems thus interesting to apply the same argument for the short-ranged spin-glass on the hypercubic lattice of dimension d with Lévy couplings. The largest barrier $B^{R1}_{max}(N = L^d)$ among $N = L^d$ barriers of the smallest scale distributed with a power-law tail scales as $B^{R1}_{max}(N = L^d) \propto N^{\frac{1}{\mu}} = L^{\frac{d}{\mu}}$ suggesting the following barrier exponent for $1 < \mu < 2$.

$$\psi^{SR}_{\mu} = \frac{d}{\mu} \tag{85}$$

VII. CONCLUSION

We have considered the long-ranged Ising spin-glass with random couplings decaying as a power-law of the distance, in the region of parameters where the energy is extensive, and where the spin-glass phase exists with a positive droplet exponent. For the Metropolis single-spin-flip dynamics near zero temperature, we have constructed via real-space renormalization the full hierarchy of relaxation times for any given realization of the random couplings. We have then analyzed the probability distribution of dynamical barriers as a function of the spatial scale. The present study represents a simple explicit example of the droplet scaling theory, where the convergence towards local equilibrium on larger and larger scales is governed by a strong hierarchy of activated dynamical processes, with valleys within valleys.

A natural question is whether the present analysis concerning spin-glasses (i) with Long-Ranged interactions (ii) with a positive droplet exponent $\theta > 0$, could be generalized to study the dynamics of long-ranged spin-glasses with negative droplet exponents, or of short-ranged spin-glasses with positive or negative droplet exponents. In our present approach, it is clear that the renormalization of the dynamical barriers is constructed on the top of a static renormalization near zero-temperature, so the first requirement is to have an appropriate renormalization for the ground-state, which is able to reproduce the correct droplet exponent θ. As explained in [35], the simple block renormalization considered in the present paper reproduces the correct droplet exponent only for Long-Ranged Spin-glasses with a positive droplet exponent $\theta > 0$, whereas for Long-Ranged Spin-glasses with negative droplet exponent $\theta < 0$, one needs to use a more complicated renormalization procedure where the boundaries of correlated clusters are not fixed a priori but are chosen as a function of the disorder realization (see [35] for more details). One expects that the same idea should be used for short-range spin-glasses, but an explicit renormalization procedure to construct the appropriate correlated clusters in each disorder realization is still lacking.

[1] J.P. Bouchaud, cond-mat/9910387, published in 'Soft and Fragile Matter: Nonequilibrium Dynamics, Metastability and Flow', M. E. Cates and M. R. Evans, Eds., IOP Publishing (Bristol and Philadelphia) 2000, pp 285-304

[2] J.P. Bouchaud, V. Dupuis, J. Hammann and E. Vincent, Phys. Rev. B 65, 024439 (2001).

[3] "Spin-glasses and random fields", Edited by A.P. Young, World Scientific, Singapore (1998).

[4] "Slow relaxations and non-equilibrium dynamics in Condensed matter", Les Houches July 2002, Edited by J.L. Barrat, M.V. Feigelman, J. Kurchan, J. Dalibard, EDP Les Ulis, Springer, Berlin.

[5] A.J. Bray, Adv. Phys. 43, 357 (1994).

[6] A.J. Bray and M. A. Moore, J. Phys. C 17 (1984) L463;
A.J. Bray and M. A. Moore, "Scaling theory of the ordered phase of spin glasses" in Heidelberg Colloquium on glassy dynamics, edited by JL van Hemmen and I. Morgenstern, Lecture notes in Physics vol 275 (1987) Springer Verlag, Heidelberg.

[7] D.S. Fisher and D.A. Huse, Phys. Rev. B38, 386 (1988);
D.S. Fisher and D.A. Huse, Phys. Rev B38, 373 (1988).

[8] D.S. Fisher and D.A. Huse, Phys. Rev. B43, 10728 (1991).
[9] D. A. Huse, Phys. Rev. B 43, 8673 (1991);
H. Yoshino, K. Hukushima and H. Takayama, Phys. Rev. B 66, 064431 (2002);
L. Berthier and J.P. Bouchaud, Phys. Rev. B 66, 054404 (2002);
L. Berthier and A.P. Young, Phys. Rev. B 69, 184423 (2004);
C. Amoruso, A.K. Hartmann and M.A. Moore, Phys. Rev. B 73, 184405 (2006);
G.A. Nemnes and K.H. Hoffmann, Computer Phys. Comm. 180, 1098 (2009).
[10] J. Kisker, L. Santen, M. Schreckenberg and H. Rieger, Phys. Rev. B 53, 6418 (1996);
H. G. Katzgraber and I.A. Campbell, Phys. Rev. B 72, 014462 (2005) ;
L.D.C. Jaubert, C. Chamon, L.F. Cugliandolo and M. Picco, J. Stat. Mech. P05001‘ (2007);
M. Baity-Jesi *et al.*, Phys. Rev. E 89, 032140 (2014).
[11] J. Mattsson, T. Jonsson,P. Nordblad, H. Aruga Katori and A. Ito, Phys. Rev. Lett. 74, 4305 (1995);
V. Dupuis, E. Vincent, J.-P. Bouchaud, J. Hammann, A. Ito and H. Aruga Katori, Phys. Rev. B 64, 174204 (2001) ;
P. E. Jonsson, H. Yoshino, P. Nordblad, H. Aruga Katori and A. Ito, Phys. Rev. Lett. 88, 257204 (2002);
F. Bert, V. Dupuis, E. Vincent, J. Hammann and J.-P. Bouchaud, Phys. Rev. Lett. 92, 167203 (2004) ;
P. E. Jonsson, H. Takayama, H. Aruga Katori and A. Ito,Phys. Rev. B 71, 180412(R) (2005) ;
P. E. Jonsson, H. Takayama, H. Aruga Katori and A. Ito, J. Magn. Magn. Mat. 310, 1494 (2007).
[12] F. Igloi and C. Monthus, Phys. Rep. 412 (2005) 277.
[13] D. Fisher, P. Le Doussal and C. Monthus, Phys. Rev. Lett. 80 (1998) 3539 ;
D. S. Fisher, P. Le Doussal and C. Monthus, Phys. Rev. E 59 (1999) 4795.
[14] F. Igloi and H. Rieger, Phys. Rev. E 58, 4238 (1998); H. Rieger and F. Igloi, Europhys. Lett. 45, 673 (1999).
[15] C. Monthus, Phys. Rev. E 67 (2003) 046109.
[16] C. Monthus and P. Le Doussal, Phys. Rev. E 65, 66129 (2002).
[17] C. Monthus and P. Le Doussal, Physica A 334 78 (2004).
[18] C. Monthus and P. Le Doussal, Physica A 317, 140 (2003).
[19] G. Schehr and P. Le Doussal, J. Stat. Mech. P01009 (2010).
[20] R. Juhasz, J. Phys. A: Math. Theor. 41 315001 (2008) ;
R. Juhasz and F. Igloi, J. Stat. Mech. P03012 (2010).
[21] C. Monthus and T. Garel, Phys. Rev. E 81, 011138 (2010).
[22] C. Monthus, Phys. Rev. E 68 (2003) 036114;
C. Monthus, Phys. Rev. E 69, 026103 (2004).
[23] D. S. Fisher, P. Le Doussal and C. Monthus, Phys. Rev. E 64 (2001) 066107.
[24] P. Le Doussal and C. Monthus, Phys. Rev. E 60 (1999) 1212.
[25] P. Le Doussal, J. Stat. Mech. P07032 (2009).
[26] J. Hooyberghs, F. Igloi and C. Vanderzande, Phys. Rev. Lett., 90, 100601 (2003) ;
J. Hooyberghs, F. Igloi and C. Vanderzande, Phys. Rev. E 69, 066140 (2004)
[27] R. Juhasz, L. Santen and F. Igloi, Phys. Rev. E72, 046129 (2005).
[28] R. Juhasz, L. Santen and F. Igloi, Phys. Rev. Lett. 94, 010601 (2005) ;
R. Juhasz, L. Santen and F. Igloi, Phys. Rev. E74, 061101 (2006) ;
R. Juhasz, and G. Odor, J. Stat. Mech. P08004 (2012).
[29] R. Juhasz, Phys. Rev. E 87, 022133 (2013) ;
R. Juhasz and I.A. Kovacs, J. Stat. Mech. P06003 (2013) ;
R. Juhasz, Phys. Rev. E 89, 032108 (2014)
[30] O. Kogan, J. L. Rogers, M. C. Cross and G. Refael, Phys. Rev. E 80, 036206 (2009) ;
T. E. Lee, G. Refael, M. C. Cross, Oleg Kogan, and J. L. Rogers, Phys. Rev. E 80, 046210 (2009) ;
T. E. Lee, H. Tam, G. Refael, J. L. Rogers, and M. C. Cross, Phys. Rev. E 82, 036202 (2010).
[31] C. Monthus and T. Garel, J. Phys. A: Math. Theor. 44 , 085001 (2011).
[32] C. Monthus and T. Garel, J. Phys. A: Math. Theor. 41 (2008) 255002;
C. Monthus and T. Garel, J. Stat. Mech. (2008) P07002;
C. Monthus and T. Garel, J. Phys. A: Math. Theor. 41 (2008) 375005.
[33] C. Monthus and T. Garel, J. Stat. Mech. P02037 (2013);
C. Monthus and T. Garel, J. Stat. Mech. P02023 (2013);
C. Monthus and T. Garel, J. Stat. Mech. P05012 (2013);
C. Monthus and T. Garel, J. Stat. Mech. P06007 (2013).
[34] C. Monthus and T. Garel, J. Stat. Mech. P05002 (2012).
[35] C. Monthus, arXiv:1403.1098.
[36] G. Kotliar, P.W. Anderson and D.L. Stein, Phys. Rev. B 27, 602 (1983).
[37] A.J. Bray, M.A. Moore and A.P. Young, Phys. Rev. Lett. 56, 2641 (1986).
[38] H.G. Katzgraber and A.P. Young, Phys. Rev. B 67, 134410 (2003).
[39] H.G. Katzgraber and A.P. Young, Phys. Rev. B 68, 224408 (2003).
[40] H.G. Katzgraber, M. Korner, F. Liers and A.K. Hartmann, Prog. Theor. Phys. Sup. 157, 59 (2005).
[41] H.G. Katzgraber, M. Korner, F. Liers, M. Junger and A.K. Hartmann, Phys. Rev. B 72, 094421 (2005).
[42] H.G. Katzgraber, J. Phys. Conf. Series 95, 012004 (2008).
[43] H. G. Katzgraber and A. P. Young, Phys. Rev. B 72, 184416 (2005).

[44] A.P. Young, J. Phys. A 41, 324016 (2008).
[45] H. G. Katzgraber, D. Larson and A. P. Young, Phys. Rev. Lett. 102, 177205 (2009).
[46] M.A. Moore, Phys. Rev. B 82, 014417 (2010).
[47] H.G. Katzgraber, A.K. Hartmann and and A.P. Young, Physics Procedia 6, 35 (2010).
[48] H.G. Katzgraber and A.K. Hartmann, Phys. Rev. Lett. 102, 037207 (2009);
H.G. Katzgraber, T. Jorg, F. Krzakala and A.K. Hartmann, Phys. Rev. B 86, 184405 (2012).
[49] T. Mori, Phys. Rev. E 84, 031128 (2011).
[50] M. Wittmann and A. P. Young, Phys. Rev. E 85, 041104 (2012)
[51] C. Monthus and T. Garel, Phys. Rev. B 88, 134204 (2013).
[52] C. Monthus and T. Garel, Phys. Rev. B 89, 014408 (2014).
[53] C. Monthus and T. Garel, J. Stat. Mech. P03020 (2014).
[54] P. Cizeau and J.P. Bouchaud, J. Phys. A Math Gen 26 L187 (1993).
[55] K. Janzen, A.K. Hartmann and A. Engel, J. Stat. Mech. P04006 (2008).
[56] K. Janzen, A. Engel and M. Mézard, EPL 89, 67002 (2010);
K. Janzen, A. Engel and M. Mézard, Phys. Rev. B 82, 021127 (2010).
[57] I. Neri, F.L. Metz and D. Bollé, J. Stat. Mech. P01010 (2010).
[58] S. Boettcher, Phil. Mag. 92, 34 (2012).
[59] J.C. Andersen, K. Janzen and H.G. Katzgraber, Phys. Rev. B 83, 174427.
[60] F. J. Dyson, Comm. Math. Phys. 12, 91 (1969) and 21, 269 (1971).
[61] P.M. Bleher and Y.G. Sinai, Comm. Math. Phys. 33, 23 (1973) and Comm. Math. Phys. 45, 247 (1975);
Ya. G. Sinai, Theor. and Math. Physics, Volume 57,1014 (1983) ;
P.M. Bleher and P. Major, Ann. Prob. 15, 431 (1987) ;
P.M. Bleher, arXiv:1010.5855.
[62] G. Gallavotti and H. Knops, Nuovo Cimento 5, 341 (1975).
[63] P. Collet and J.P. Eckmann, "A Renormalization Group Analysis of the Hierarchical Model in Statistical Mechanics", Lecture Notes in Physics, Springer Verlag Berlin (1978).
[64] G. Jona-Lasinio, Phys. Rep. 352, 439 (2001).
[65] G.A. Baker, Phys. Rev. B 5, 2622 (1972);
G.A. Baker and G.R. Golner, Phys. Rev. Lett. 31, 22 (1973);
G.A. Baker and G.R. Golner, Phys. Rev. B 16, 2081 (1977);
G.A. Baker, M.E. Fisher and P. Moussa, Phys. Rev. Lett. 42, 615 (1979).
[66] J.B. McGuire, Comm. Math. Phys. 32, 215 (1973).
[67] A J Guttmann, D Kim and C J Thompson, J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. 10 L125 (1977);
D Kim and C J Thompson J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. 11, 375 (1978) ;
D Kim and C J Thompson J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. 11, 385 (1978);
D Kim, J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. 13 3049 (1980).
[68] D Kim and C J Thompson J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. 10, 1579 (1977).
[69] C. Monthus and T. Garel, J. Stat. Mech. P02023 (2013).
[70] G J Rodgers and A J Bray, J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. 21 2177 (1988).
[71] C. Monthus and T. Garel, J. Stat. Mech. P07010 (2011)
[72] A. Bovier, J. Stat. Phys. 59, 745 (1990).
[73] S. Molchanov, 'Hierarchical random matrices and operators, Application to the Anderson model' in 'Multidimensional statistical analysis and theory of random matrices' edited by A.K. Gupta and V.L. Girko, VSP Utrecht (1996).
[74] E. Kritchevski, Proc. Am. Math. Soc. 135, 1431 (2007) and Ann. Henri Poincare 9, 685 (2008);
E. Kritchevski 'Hierarchical Anderson Model' in 'Probability and mathematical physics : a volume in honor of S. Molchanov' edited by D. A. Dawson et al. , Am. Phys. Soc. (2007).
[75] S. Kuttruf and P. Müller, Ann. Henri Poincare 13, 525 (2012)
[76] Y.V. Fyodorov, A. Ossipov and A. Rodriguez, J. Stat. Mech. L12001 (2009).
[77] E. Bogomolny and O. Giraud, Phys. Rev. Lett. 106, 044101 (2011).
[78] I. Rushkin, A. Ossipov and Y.V. Fyodorov, arXiv:1101.4532.
[79] C. Monthus and T. Garel, J. Stat. Mech. P05005 (2011).
[80] S. Franz, T. Jorg and G. Parisi, J. Stat. Mech. P02002 (2009).
[81] M. Castellana, A. Decelle, S. Franz, M. Mézard and G. Parisi, Phys. Rev. Lett. 104, 127206 (2010).
[82] M. Castellana and G. Parisi, Phys. Rev. E 82, 040105(R) (2010) ;
M. Castellana and G. Parisi, Phys. Rev. E 83, 041134 (2011) .
[83] M. Castellana, Europhysics Letters 95 (4) 47014 (2011).
[84] M.C. Angelini, G. Parisi and F. Ricci-Tersenghi, Phys. Rev. B 87, 134201 (2013).
[85] C. W. Gardiner, " Handbook of Stochastic Methods: for Physics, Chemistry and the Natural Sciences" (Springer Series in Synergetics), Berlin (1985).
[86] N.G. Van Kampen, "Stochastic processes in physics and chemistry", Elsevier Amsterdam (1992).
[87] H. Risken, "The Fokker-Planck equation : methods of solutions and applications", Springer Verlag Berlin (1989).
[88] C. Monthus and T. Garel, J. Stat. Mech. P12017 (2009).
[89] S. Pigolotti and A. Vulpiani, J. Chem. Phys. 128, 154114 (2008).
[90] B. Derrida, Le Journal de Physique Lettres (France) 46, L401 (1985).

[91] M. Castellana, A. Decelle, S. Franz, M. Mézard and G. Parisi, Phys. Rev. Lett. 104, 127206 (2010).
[92] C. Monthus and T. Garel, J Phys. A : Math. Theor. 41, 115002 (2008).